DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 760 CE 034 289

TITLE	Insights into CETA's In-School Youth Programs.
INSTITUTION	General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	GAO/HRD-82-116
PUB DATE	28 Sep 82
NOTE	55p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Analysis; *Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Research; Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Participant Satisfaction; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; School Districts; School Involvement; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Students; Student Attitudes; Vocational Education; *Youth Employment; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Youth Employment Training Program

ABSTRACT

In-school youth programs that operated under Title IVA-3, Youth Employment and Training Programs (YETP), and under Title IIB of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) were reviewed. Standardized survey questionnaires mailed to former participants in the IIB and YETP in-school youth programs focused on post-termination education, employment experiences and views on how programs helped with education/employment goals. Survey questionnaires mailed to prime sponsors obtained information on structure and operation of 1981 in-school youth programs and views on potential provisions of future employment and training legislation. More prime sponsors served in-school youth under YETP than under IIB, but there were few statistically significant differences between the two programs. Those differences tended to stem from specific objectives in the YETP legislation. More YETP participants were awarded academic credit, and YETP permitted a greater array of services. Also, few differences were found between YETP and IIB participants. This seven-page narrative summary of results is followed by appendixes including a more detailed discussion, data on sponsor views on future employment and training programs, review methodology, and data tables of questionnaire results. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

REPORT BY THE U.S.

General Accounting Office

Insights Into CETA's In-School Youth Programs

GAO reviewed CETA's in-school youth programs under the Services for the Economically Disadvantaged program and the Youth Employment and Training Programs. This report notes that significantly more CETA prime sponsors served in-school youth under the Youth Employment and Training Programs than under the other program.

In comparing the in-school youth programs, GAO found few significant differences. Where differences did exist, they tended to stem from specific requirements in the Youth Employment and Training Programs' legislation.

This report also discusses the education and employment experiences of youth who had left the in-school youth programs, and their views about the programs' helpfulness in reaching education and employment goals.

CE 03478 88

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

GAO/HRD-82-116
SEPTEMBER 28, 1982

Request for copies of GAO reports should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Document Handling and Information
Services Facility
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, Md. 20760

Telephone (202) 275-6241

The first five copies of individual reports are free of charge. Additional copies of bound audit reports are $3.25 each. Additional copies of unbound report (i.e., letter reports) and most other publications are $1.00 each. There will be a 25% discount on all orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address. Sales orders must be prepaid on a cash, check, or money order basis. Check should be made out to the "Superintendent of Documents".

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

HUMAN RESOURCES
DIVISION

B-205705

The Honorable Dan Quayle
Chairman, Subcommittee on Employment
and Productivity
Committee on Labor and Human
Resources
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In your September 3, 1981, letter, you asked us to review in-school youth programs operated under title IVA-3, Youth Employment and Training Programs (YETP), and under title IIB of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). Specifically, you wanted to know

--the differences and similarities between programs established under YETP and title IIB, including the nature and extent of local educational agency (LEA) involvement;

--the education and employment experiences of youth who had left the in-school youth programs; and

--the views of participants about the programs' helpfulness in reaching education and employment goals.

In essence, we found that the similarities between the two types of programs were more common than the differences. Where differences did exist, they tended to stem from specific requirements in the YETP legislation.

This letter summarizes what we found. A more detailed discussion is contained in appendix I.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

To obtain the information you requested, we approached our work from two perspectives. First, we mailed a standardized survey questionnaire to former participants in IIB and YETP in-school youth programs. The questionnaire focused mainly on participants' post-termination education and employment experiences and their views on how the programs helped them with their education/employment goals. In addition, we obtained from prime sponsors' case files a standardized set of data on each randomly selected former participant.

Time limitations and resource constraints precluded our sampling former fiscal year 1981 participants nationwide; therefore, we judgmentally selected eight prime sponsors and randomly selected 884 youths who had terminated from their programs during the first 9 months of fiscal year 1981. About 80 percent responded to our questionnaire. Because we drew the sample from only eight prime sponsors, the information we report on participants applies only to those eight sponsors and not to the nationwide universe.

Our sampling plan was designed to yield an expected sampling error of plus or minus 8 percent at the 95-percent confidence level. The actual sampling error, however, on any particular response may be greater or smaller than the planned sampling error.

Second, we designed a standardized survey questionnaire to obtain data about the structure and operation of prime sponsors' fiscal year 1981 in-school youth programs and sponsors' views on potential provisions of future employment and training legislation. Our staff obtained the data for the eight judgmentally selected sponsors, and we randomly selected a nationwide sample of 46 other prime sponsors to whom we mailed the questionnaire--41 of them responded. To generate results statistically projectable nationwide, we combined, on a weighted basis, the data for the 8 judgmentally selected prime sponsors with data for the 41 sponsors who responded to our questionnaire. Our results are projectable to 418 of 463 CETA prime sponsors. (See pp. 24 and 27.) Our sampling plan was designed for an overall sampling error of plus or minus 10 percent at the 95-percent confidence level. However, the actual sampling error on any particular response may be greater or smaller than planned.

COMPARISON OF STRUCTURE OF IN-SCHOOL YOUTH PROGRAMS

The data collected allowed several points of comparison: (1) types of programs, (2) extent of sponsor-LEA linkage, (3) percent of funds spent under LEA agreements, (4) arrangements for provision of activities and services, and (5) arrangements for award of academic credit. We also obtained sponsors' views on how YETP had affected sponsor-LEA relationships.

Types of programs offered

All of the sponsors had YETP in-school youth programs in fiscal year 1981. Significantly fewer (67 percent) had IIB in-school youth programs. For YETP, 98 percent of the sponsors had offered work experience programs. Twenty-four percent had offered on-the-job training (OJT), and 20 percent, classroom skill

training. Separate transition-services-only programs had been established by about 25 percent of the sponsors under YETP. About 70 percent of the sponsors strongly favored maintaining a separately funded youth program in future employment and training legislation, and about 90 percent said they favored providing services to in-school youth.

For IIB, of those sponsors that had in-school youth programs in fiscal year 1981, 93 percent had offered work experience programs. In contrast to YETP, however, significantly fewer sponsors had offered OJT and classroom training--about 11 and 8 percent, respectively. Also, significantly fewer sponsors had established separate transition service programs under IIB--about 4 percent.

Extent to which sponsors had written agreements with LEAs for in-school youth programs

Title IIB does not require prime sponsors to devote a specific level of effort for in-school youth, but YETP requires sponsors to spend at least 22 percent of their YETP allocations on in-school youth pursuant to written agreements with LEAs.

Significantly more sponsors had written LEA agreements for YETP than for IIB: 99.8 percent (all sponsors but one) for YETP versus 37 percent for IIB. But it must be remembered that only 67 percent of the sponsors had IIB in-school programs, and of these sponsors, 55 percent had written LEA agreements.

Of all the LEA relationships that existed for YETP in fiscal year 1981, 44 percent had existed before YETP was enacted but 33 percent of them were not formalized in written agreements. In general, the sponsors indicated positive attitudes toward LEAs and in only 1 out of 10 cases did they say they would have used non-LEA contractors to a greater extent if there was no YETP set-aside requirement. Also, the sponsors reported that 68 percent of their LEA relationships had either improved greatly or improved somewhat since the enactment of YETP. However, about 70 percent of the sponsors expressed a basically unfavorable attitude toward mandating monetary set asides for LEA agreements in future employment and training legislation.

Level of expenditures under LEA agreements

About 97 percent of the sponsors had spent at least 22 percent of their fiscal year 1981 YETP allocation pursuant to LEA agreements. The most spent by a single sponsor was about 85 percent, and in total, the sponsors had spent about 36 percent pursuant to LEA agreements.

Looking only at sponsors with IIB in-school youth programs, they had spent, as a group, about 3 percent of their IIB grants on in-school youth under written LEA agreements. For these sponsors, as a proportion of all IIB participants, in-school youth comprised from 2 to 56 percent.

Activities and services provided to in-school youth

The YETP and IIB programs were similar with respect to types of activities and services provided and who provided the predominant activity--work experience. In both YETP and IIB, work experience was the predominant activity provided for in LEA agreements and in non-LEA contracts. About 96 percent of both YETP and IIB LEA agreements provided for work experience. The LEA was the sole provider in 36 percent of the YETP agreements and 53 percent of the IIB agreements.

Arrangements for academic credit

For YETP, sponsors must encourage LEAs to award academic credit for competencies participants gain from the program. In YETP about 87 percent of the sponsors said they had made arrangements for the award of academic credit in at least one LEA agreement. In IIB, about 54 percent of the sponsors with LEA agreements said they had made arrangements for award of academic credit in at least one LEA agreement.

CHARACTERISTICS AND PROGRAM EXPERIENCES OF PARTICIPANTS

The primary programs in which former participants had been enrolled were IIB work experience (IIBWE) and YETP career employment experience (CEE). No statistically significant differences were found in the racial or sexual composition of IIBWE and CEE participants, but IIBWE participants tended to be younger than CEE participants--not a surprising result because title IIB permits the enrollment of 14- and 15-year-old youth but YETP generally does not. Statistically significant differences in economic status also existed. Those with incomes of 70 percent or less of the Bureau of Labor Statistics lower living standard income level (LLSIL) comprised 88 percent in CEE versus 95 percent in IIBWE. (See p. 12.) This too was not a surprising result since IIB restricts eligibility to those with family incomes of 70 percent or less of LLSIL. We found few differences between IIBWE and CEE participants in terms of months enrolled in the program, months enrolled in other programs, types of other programs enrolled in, types of work experience jobs held while in IIBWE or CEE, or reason for termination.

EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCES OF PARTICIPANTS

Educational experience of former participants

Most IIBWE and CEE respondents were attending some kind of school at the time of our survey. The number in IIBWE was significantly more than in CEE: 74 percent in IIBWE compared to 57 percent in CEE. Of those still in school, significantly more were attending high school in IIBWE than in CEE: 52 percent in IIBWE and 31 percent in CEE. Although most of the respondents who were no longer in school had either graduated from high school or obtained a high school equivalency certificate, many had dropped out of high school before graduating: 42 percent in IIBWE and 38 percent in CEE. This latter difference was not statistically significant.

Employment experiences of former participants

About the same proportion of IIBWE and CEE respondents had found unsubsidized jobs after leaving the program: 55 percent in IIBWE and 63 percent in CEE. However, many who had found jobs were unemployed at the time of our survey: 41 percent in IIBWE and 49 percent in CEE. This difference was not statistically significant.

In both IIBWE and CEE, a higher proportion of respondents no longer in school had found unsubsidized jobs: about 74 percent in both IIBWE and CEE. But, of those no longer in school who had found jobs, many in both CEE and IIBWE were unemployed at the time of our survey: 41 percent in IIBWE and 66 percent in CEE. This difference was not statistically significant.

The predominant types of work done by respondents in their first unsubsidized job after termination from the programs were in the fields of food service/restaurant, clerical/secretarial, retail trade, and maintenance/general repair.

VIEWS OF PARTICIPANTS ON HOW THE PROGRAMS HELPED THEM

Of the respondents who had found an unsubsidized job after leaving the program, about the same number in IIBWE and CEE said the program had provided either knowledge, skills, training, or other help that had assisted them in getting their first job: 52 percent in IIBWE and 54 percent in CEE. Of those who had left their first unsubsidized job but were employed in another job at

the time of our survey, the number who said the program had in some way helped them get their current job was significantly different: 54 percent in IIBWE and 31 percent in CEE.

Our questionnaire asked respondents to consider possible types of help the program may have provided and to indicate those they found most helpful. In both IIBWE and CEE, the types of help found to be most helpful related to learning about job preferences, learning proper on-the-job behavior, and learning job seeking skills. There were no statistically significant differences between IIBWE and CEE.

About one-third or less of the respondents said the program had helped them stay in school: 27 percent in IIBWE and 35 percent in CEE. Narrowing the analysis to those who had left the program because of graduation, we found that significantly more in CEE than in IIBWE said the program had helped them to stay in school: 51 percent in CEE and 24 percent in IIBWE. Also, among those who had found an unsubsidized job, significantly more in CEE said the program had helped them stay in school: 38 percent in CEE and 29 percent in IIBWE.

Few respondents said the sponsors had helped them find a job when the program ended: 8 percent in IIBWE and 6 percent in CEE. Among those who had left the program because of graduation, those who said the sponsors had helped them find a job constituted 10 percent in IIBWE and 9 percent in CEE.

A vast majority of the respondents in IIBWE and CEE said that their overall experience in the program was either very good or somewhat good: 92 percent in IIBWE and 95 percent in CEE.

CONCLUSIONS

Significantly more prime sponsors served in-school youth under YETP than under IIB, but we found few statistically significant differences between the programs. In essence, the similarities between the two programs were far more noticeable than the differences. However, there were some basic differences that could have implications for future employment and training legislation.

The Congress established YETP in part to forge a link between school systems and employment and training programs for youth. YETP requires prime sponsors (1) to spend at least 22 percent of their funds pursuant to written agreements with LEAs and (2) to encourage LEAs to award participants academic credit for competencies gained from program participation. With respect to these two requirements, there were differences between YETP and IIB programs.

Under YETP, prime sponsors had more LEA agreements and spent considerably more dollars pursuant to those agreements than under IIB. Similarly, more prime sponsors had made arrangements with LEAs for awarding academic credit under YETP than under IIB. While few participants had received academic credit for either program, significantly more participants had been awarded credit for YETP than for IIB (22 percent compared to 13 percent).

Both IIB and YETP provided a variety of activities and services to in-school youth, but YETP permits a greater array of services. Even so, there were no statistically significant differences between the programs in terms of activities or services sponsors provided to participants under LEA agreements or under contracts with non-LEA organizations.

Regarding participants, we found few differences between YETP and IIB. A profile of those who participated in IIB and YETP revealed that the participants had similar demographic characteristics, such as race and sex, as well as CETA experiences and public assistance status. They differed, however, in terms of economic status and age.

Given the attention which has been focused on merging IIB and YETP, the data presented in this report point out that the differences found between the two programs tended to stem from specific objectives in the YETP legislation. The differences in formal sponsor-LEA linkage and awarding of academic credit suggest that continued realization of these objectives may require specific attention in future legislation. On the other hand and of no less importance is the fact that the data also reveal many similarities between CETA's two in-school youth programs.

- - - -

Labor reviewed a copy of the draft report and expressed no disagreements with the information presented. As discussed with your office, we are sending copies of this report to the Secretary of Labor and other interested parties. Copies will also be made available to other parties upon request.

Sincerely yours,

Gregory J. Ahart
Director

Contents

APPENDIX		Page
I	INSIGHTS INTO CETA'S IN-SCHOOL YOUTH PROGRAMS	1
	Introduction	1
	Objectives, scope, and methodology	2
	Comparison of structure of in-school youth programs	4
	Characteristics and program experiences of participants	9
	Education and employment experiences of participants	16
	Views of participants on how the programs helped them	17
	Conclusions	20
II	SPONSOR VIEWS ON FUTURE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS	22
III	REVIEW METHODOLOGY	24
IV	RESPONSE DATA, SAMPLING ERRORS, AND STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR SELECTED PARTICIPANT AND PRIME SPONSOR QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS	30

ABBREVIATIONS

CEE	career employment experience
CETA	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
GAO	General Accounting Office
IIBWE	IIB work experience
LEA	local educational agency
LLSIL	lower living standard income level
OJT	on-the-job training
SYEP	Summer Youth Employment Program
TSO	transition services only
YETP	Youth Employment and Training Programs

INSIGHTS INTO CETA'S IN-SCHOOL YOUTH PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

On September 3, 1981, the Chairman, Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity, Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, asked GAO to review in-school youth programs operated under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), as amended. 1/ The programs of interest to the Subcommittee were authorized under title IVA-3, Youth Employment and Training Programs (YETP), and under title IIB, Services for the Economically Disadvantaged. Specifically, the Subcommittee wanted to know

--the differences and similarities between programs established under YETP and title IIB, including the nature and extent of local educational agency (LEA) involvement;

--the education and employment experiences of youth who had left the in-school youth programs; and

--the views of participants about the programs' helpfulness in reaching education and employment goals.

Although title IIB authorizes service for economically disadvantaged youth (in and out-of-school), it has no programs with a required level of service for in-school youth. Also, title IIB does not require any prime sponsor-LEA linkage for serving in-school youth, nor does it specifically require sponsors to encourage LEAs to award participants academic credit for CETA experience. 2/

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 amended CETA and established what is now title IVA, Youth Employment Demonstration Programs, to explore locally various methods for dealing with youth unemployment problems. As part of title IVA, YETP mandates that at least 22 percent of grant allocations be spent on in-school youth. The activities and services allowed under YETP and IIB are in large part the same, but YETP requires

---

1/In-school youth means a person age 14 to 21 who either (1) is enrolled full time in and attending, or is scheduled to attend full time during the next regular session, an elementary, secondary, trade, technical, or vocational school or junior or community college or (2) has not completed high school and is attending or is scheduled to attend on a full-time basis a program leading to a secondary school diploma or its equivalent.

2/CETA programs generally are implemented by individual or consortiums of employment and training agencies of State and local governments called prime sponsors. Sponsors obtain grants from Labor and in turn implement the programs through a network of subgrantees/contractors.

prime sponsor-LEA linkage through written agreements in meeting the 22 percent set-aside requirement. Also, under YETP, sponsors must encourage LEAs to award academic credit for the competencies participants gain from the program.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Based on the Subcommittee's request, our review objectives were to determine

--the differences and similarities between programs established under YETP and IIB, including the nature and extent of LEA involvement;

--the education and employment experiences of youths who had left the in-school youth programs; and

--the views of participants about the programs' helpfulness in reaching education and employment goals.

To meet these objectives, we approached our work from two perspectives. First, we mailed a standardized survey questionnaire to former participants in IIB and YETP in-school youth programs. Time limitations and resource constraints precluded us from selecting a nationwide random sample of former participants; therefore, we judgmentally selected eight prime sponsors and randomly selected a total of 884 youths who had terminated from their in-school youth programs during the first 9 months of fiscal year 1981. Because we used judgmental rather than statistical sampling for the prime sponsors, the information we report on participants applies only to the eight prime sponsors. The questionnaire focused mainly on participants' post-termination education and employment experiences and their views on how the program helped them with their education/employment goals. In addition, we collected from prime sponsors' case files a standardized set of data on each randomly selected former participant. Data collected included demographic information, such as age, sex, race, and economic status; type of last work experience job; and academic credit received for CETA participation.

Of the 884 former participants, 708 (80.1 percent) responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire results are projectable to former participants in the combined programs of the eight sponsors.

Second, we designed a standardized survey questionnaire to obtain data about the structure and operation of prime sponsors' fiscal year 1981 in-school youth programs and sponsors' views on potential provisions of future employment and training legislation. Our staff collected the data for the eight sponsors. Additionally, we randomly selected a nationwide sample of 46 other prime sponsors to whom we mailed the questionnaire and 41 of them responded.

To generate results statistically projectable nationwide, we combined, on a weighted basis, the data for the 8 selected prime sponsors and the 41 sponsors who responded to our questionnaire. Our results are projectable to 418 of 463 CETA prime sponsors. (See app. III for a more detailed description of our methodology and scope.)

Our review was performed in accordance with GAO's current "Standards for Audit of Governmental Organizations, Programs, Activities, and Functions."

Statistical significance of differences in response results

The reader will note that, in comparing various questionnaire response results, we state whether differences between programs were significant in a statistical sense. At times our conclusions may seem conflicting because occasionally relatively small differences in response results are described as statistically significant, while at other times relatively large differences are described as not statistically significant. The explanation of this seeming conflict is that the results of statistical sampling are subject to uncertainty, or sampling error, because only a portion of the universe is selected for analysis.

In designing a sampling plan, an evaluator can select a sample size expected to yield a sampling error of a given magnitude. However, for any particular question, the actual sampling error magnitude depends on the percentage of respondents who answered the question, the percentage of times it was appropriate to respond to the question, and the distribution of responses. If the combined variations in these factors are greater or smaller than expected, then the sampling error may be larger or smaller than expected.

Thus, for example, one might find that 25 percent of the respondents in hypothetical program 1 answer "yes" to a particular question and 50 percent in program 2 say "yes." On the surface, this appears to be a significant difference. However, if the sampling errors for these response rates were 20 percent, then the true values could fall anywhere from 20 percent below the response rate to 20 percent above the response rate. Therefore, the true value for program 1 could range from 5 to 45 percent and for program 2, from 30 to 70 percent. As a result, the ranges within which the true values could reside overlap by 15 percentage points, thus removing any significance from the difference in the response rates on the basis of the sampling plans.

On the other hand, if the response results had been much closer, say 25 percent for program 1 and 32 percent for program 2 and the sampling errors were only 2 percent, the true value for program 1 could range anywhere from 23 to 27 percent and for program 2,

from 30 to 34 percent. In this case, the ranges have no overlap, and a test of statistical significance (t-test) would likely reveal a statistically significant difference.

COMPARISON OF STRUCTURE OF IN-SCHOOL YOUTH PROGRAMS

The data collected allowed several points of comparison: (1) types of programs, (2) extent of sponsor-LEA linkage, (3) percent of funds spent under LEA agreements, (4) arrangements for provision of activities and services, and (5) arrangements for award of academic credit. We also obtained sponsors' views on how YETP had affected sponsor-LEA relationships.

Types of programs offered

YETP was not intended to replace IIB youth programs. CETA reflected that intent by requiring that services to youth under IIB not be reduced. 1/ Under IIB, sponsors may provide youth with three categories of employment and training activities: classroom training, on-the-job training (OJT), and work experience. Sponsors also may provide school-to-work, transition-type services.

Classroom training normally is conducted in an institutional setting and should provide the technical skills and information needed to do a specific job or group of jobs. It also may include other training, such as remedial education, to enhance employability by upgrading basic skills. Participants are paid an allowance for time spent in the classroom.

OJT is a program for participants who have been hired by a public or private sector employer. OJT should provide the knowledge or skills needed to do a job fully and adequately. CETA reimburses the employer for up to 50 percent of OJT participants' wages.

Work experience is a short-term or part-time work assignment with a public or private nonprofit employer. It is designed to develop good work habits and basic work skills in persons who either have never worked or have not worked in a long time. CETA pays the participants' wages.

Sponsors may also provide in-school youth with services that facilitate the transition from school to work. The services should maximize employment opportunities or facilitate participation in other CETA activities leading to unsubsidized employment. Transition-type services, which sponsors may provide directly

1/This maintenance of effort provision was deleted for fiscal year 1982 by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.

or through referral, fall into several categories: employment and training, supportive, and post-termination services. Examples are shown below.

Examples of Services Authorized Under Title IIB

(1) Employment and training services	(2) Supportive services	(3) Post-termination services
--Orientation to work world --Counseling --Employability assessment --Job development --Job search assistance --Job referral and placement --Vocational exploration	--Health care --Child care --Transportation --Family planning --Legal services	Services in columns 1 and 2 may be given for up to 90 days to participants who enter unsubsidized employment.

YETP in-school programs must provide school-to-work transition services or career employment experience (CEE), or both. Transition services include those available under IIB, plus additional ones listed in CETA regulations, such as literacy training, attainment of high school equivalency certificate, and overcoming sex stereotyping. CEE is a combination of work experience or OJT, and certain transition services. The minimum transition services that CEE participants must receive are career information, counseling, occupational information, and placement.

We found that all of the sponsors had YETP in-school youth programs in fiscal year 1981, but significantly fewer--66.5 percent--had IIB in-school youth programs. For YETP, 97.6 percent of the sponsors had offered CEE work experience programs. About 24 percent of the sponsors had offered OJT, and about 20 percent had offered classroom skill training. About 25 percent of the sponsors had established separate transition-services-only programs under YETP. A significant portion--about 70 percent--of the sponsors strongly favored maintaining a separately funded youth program in future employment and training legislation, and about 90 percent said they favored preserving service to in-school youth.

For IIB, of those sponsors that had in-school youth programs in fiscal year 1981, 92.8 percent had offered work experience programs. However, in comparison to YETP, significantly fewer of the sponsors offered OJT and classroom skill training under IIB. About 11 percent had offered OJT and 8 percent, classroom skill training.

Also, significantly fewer of them had established separate transition service programs under IIB--about 4 percent compared to 25 percent under YETP.

Extent to which sponsors entered LEA agreements for in-school programs

Title IIB does not require prime sponsors to devote a specific level of effort for in-school youth, but YETP requires sponsors to spend at least 22 percent of their YETP allocations on in-school youth. In meeting this requirement, sponsors must spend the funds pursuant to written agreements with LEAs responsible for public elementary or secondary schools. The agreements must describe activities and services to be provided and must detail each party's responsibility for providing services and activities.

We found that significantly more sponsors had written LEA agreements for YETP than for IIB: 99.8 percent (all sponsors but one) for YETP versus 36.8 percent for IIB. But it must be remembered that only 66.5 percent of the sponsors had IIB in-school youth programs, and of these sponsors, 55.4 percent had written LEA agreements.

The one sponsor that had not entered an LEA agreement for YETP had failed to do so because of LEA reluctance to administer the program, but the sponsor had contracted with non-LEA organizations to operate the program in cooperation with the LEA. This sponsor was successful in consummating an LEA agreement for its fiscal year 1982 YETP program.

Although virtually all sponsors had entered LEA agreements for YETP, about 37 percent also had contracted with non-LEA organizations to operate part of the program. Another 17 percent of the sponsors also had administered some activities or services, providing them either directly or through referrals.

As mentioned earlier, of the sponsors that had IIB in-school programs, 55.4 percent had written LEA agreements. Similar to YETP, about 38 percent also had contracted with non-LEA organizations to operate IIB programs. Those who also had administered some activities or services, either directly or through referral, comprised 48 percent--significantly more than for YETP.

Of all the LEA relationships that existed for YETP in fiscal year 1981, about 44 percent of the sponsors had joint programs with the LEAs even before YETP was enacted. Although about 33 percent of the pre-YETP relationships were not formalized in written agreements, the sponsors characterized about 76 percent of the relationships as either very good or somewhat good. Of the pre-YETP written agreements, 72 percent were nonfinancial, that is, no funds were actually transferred to LEAs. Of the

agreements that existed in fiscal year 1981, about 53 percent were nonfinancial, but this difference was not statistically significant.

In general, the sponsors indicated positive attitudes toward LEAs and said in only 10 percent of the cases they would have used non-LEA contractors to a greater extent if the YETP set-aside requirement had not existed. Also, the sponsors reported that 68 percent of their LEA relationships had either improved greatly or improved somewhat since the enactment of YETP. However, about 70 percent of the sponsors expressed a basically unfavorable attitude toward mandating LEA set asides in future employment and training legislation.

Level of expenditures under LEA agreements

For YETP, prime sponsors must spend at least 22 percent of their fiscal year allocation on in-school youth pursuant to written LEA agreements. In order to carry out the purposes of an LEA agreement, the LEA or sponsor may enter subagreements, grants, or contracts with postsecondary schools, State accredited profit and nonprofit educational institutions, public employment service agencies, and community-based organizations.

Agreements with LEAs may be financial or nonfinancial, whichever is deemed most appropriate by sponsors and LEAs. Analysis of the extent to which sponsors entered financial agreements revealed that many more did so under YETP than IIB, a not surprising result considering the legislative mandate.

On an individual basis, we estimate that 97.4 percent of the sponsors had spent at least 22 percent of their fiscal year 1981 YETP allocations pursuant to LEA agreements. One judgmentally selected sponsor, representing 0.2 percent of the projected 418 sponsors, had made plans to spend 22 percent, but a third-quarter rescission of YETP allocations affected the planned activities and the sponsor spent 21 percent. One randomly selected sponsor, representing 2.4 percent of the projected 418 sponsors, had spent only about 11 percent. The sponsor said that the LEAs had been unable to fully spend their allocations because fiscal year 1981 YETP allocations were not available until December 1980, 4 months after the school year began.

The most spent by a single sponsor was about 85 percent, but as a group, the sponsors had spent about 36 percent pursuant to LEA agreements. This included amounts spent under contracts with non-LEA organizations in order to carry out the purposes of the LEA agreements.

Looking at sponsors with IIB in-school programs, we found that as a group they spent 2.6 percent of their total final IIB grants on in-school youth under written LEA agreements. For these sponsors, as a proportion of all IIB participants, in-school youth comprised from 2 to 56 percent.

Activities and services provided to in-school youth

With respect to types of activities and services provided and who provided the predominant activity--work experience--the YETP and IIB programs were very similar. We found no statistically significant differences, as evidenced in the tables on pages 9, 37, and 38.

In both YETP and IIB, work experience was the predominant activity provided for in LEA agreements and in non-LEA contracts. About 96 percent of both YETP and IIB LEA agreements provided for work experience, and the LEA was the sole provider in 36 percent of the YETP agreements and 53 percent of the IIB agreements. In the case of non-LEA contracts, about 65 percent of YETP contracts and 83 percent of IIB contracts provided for work experience. Contractors were the sole provider in 56 percent of the YETP contracts and 72 percent of the IIB contracts.

Only about 11 percent of the YETP and 4 percent of IIB LEA agreements provided for classroom skills training. In the case of non-LEA contracts, about 15 percent of YETP and 4 percent of IIB contracts provided for skills training. However, about 81 percent of the sponsors favored, to at least a moderate extent, emphasizing skills training in future employment and training legislation.

Comparison of Types of Activities and Selected Services Provided Under YETP and IIB

Activities provided	Percent of LEA agreements YETP	Percent of LEA agreements IIB	Percent of non-LEA contracts YETP	Percent of non-LEA contracts IIB
Work experience	95.6	96.4	65.1	82.8
Classroom skills training	11.2	3.7	14.9	3.8
Other classroom training (e.g., remedial education)	33.3	10.9	40.7	26.3
On-the-job training	18.2	6.0	14.0	-
Services provided				
Orientation to work world	100.0	98.7	88.0	69.4
Counseling or testing	100.0	100.0	90.8	89.2
Employability assessment (other than at intake)	93.8	99.9	78.9	72.0
Job development	96.0	95.1	81.4	83.3
Job search assistance	95.5	83.3	69.7	78.0
Job referral/placement	96.1	84.4	83.9	89.2
Vocational exploration	27.6	16.6	21.1	12.4
Education-to-work transition activities	74.5	57.0	76.1	48.4
Labor market information	95.6	97.4	87.4	84.9
Job sampling	32.2	16.8	37.9	24.7

Arrangements for academic credit

For YETP, sponsors must encourage LEAs to award academic credit for competencies participants gain from the program. In YETP about 87 percent of the sponsors with LEA agreements said they had made arrangements for the award of academic credit in at least one LEA agreement. In IIB, about 54 percent of the sponsors with LEA agreements said they had made arrangements for award of academic credit in at least one LEA agreement. The percentage difference between the two was fairly large, but considering the YETP legislative mandate, was not surprising.

Only 27.3 percent of the sponsors strongly favored placing an academic credit requirement in future employment and training legislation. As pointed out later, relatively few YETP or IIB former participants whom we surveyed had received academic credit for their participation in the programs. (See p. 15.)

CHARACTERISTICS AND PROGRAM EXPERIENCES OF PARTICIPANTS

Our work at the eight prime sponsors we visited gave us the chance to learn about the participants' education, training, and employment experiences while in CETA.

APPENDIX I

Because the post-program education and employment experiences of former participants should be considered in light of their demographic characteristics and their experiences while in the program, we are presenting data on characteristics and experiences at this point. The former participants whom we surveyed had been enrolled in and had terminated from either IIB work experience (IIBWE) programs, CEE programs, or YETP transition-services-only (TSO) programs. Because TSO is so different from IIBWE and CEE and consequently lacks comparability, we do not narratively describe TSO data but include selected TSO data in tabular presentations.

Participant characteristics

The sex of former participants in both CEE and IIBWE basically was evenly divided between male and female.

Sex of Respondents

Sex	Percent of respondents IIBWE	CEE	TSO
Male	45.7	50.1	39.0
Female	54.3	49.9	61.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0

Differences in the racial makeup of IIBWE and CEE participants were not significant. Most were black, followed by white and Hispanic. Few or none were American Indian, Alaskan native, Asian, or Pacific Islander.

Race of Respondents

Race	Percent of respondents IIBWE	CEE	TSO
White	21.1	26.9	7.1
Black	61.6	56.2	87.8
Hispanic	16.5	14.1	5.1
American Indian or Alaskan native	0.0	0.5	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.8	2.3	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0

In terms of age, youth 14 to 21 years old are eligible for all IIB in-school programs. On the other hand, youth age 14 and 15 may participate in YETP only if the program is designed to provide broad career exposure. Thus, CEE is reserved basically for youth age 16 to 21. Consequently, one might expect to see age differences between the programs.

Age differences of former participants at the time of enrollment were significant in the age 14 and 15 categories where they comprised 31.1 percent in IIBWE and only 4.7 percent in CEE. Also, in the age 17 category, the difference was significant: 27.8 percent in IIBWE and 44.1 percent in CEE.

Age of Respondents at Time of Enrollment

Age	Percent of respondents IIBWE	CEE	TSO
14	11.3	1.1	37.4
15	19.8	3.6	15.3
16	28.4	31.5	21.6
17	27.8	44.1	16.4
18	10.1	14.0	5.3
19	1.9	3.8	3.4
20	0.3	1.2	0.7
21	0.3	0.7	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean age	16.1	16.9	15.5

In terms of economic status, in-school youth are eligible for IIB programs if they are economically disadvantaged. An economically disadvantaged person is one who is either

--a member of a family receiving public assistance;

--a member of a family whose annualized income during the previous 6 months did not exceed 70 percent of the lower living standard income level (LLSIL) 1/ or would have qualified the family for public assistance if it had applied for such assistance;

--a person subject to significant employment barriers, such as a handicap or imprisonment; or

--a person who is a regular mental outpatient.

The YETP program has one basic difference in economic status eligibility requirements. A youth is eligible if his or her family's annualized income for the previous 6 months does not

---

1/The LLSIL is an income level (adjusted for selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas and regional metropolitan and nonmetropolitan differences and family size) determined annually by the Secretary of Labor based upon the most recent lower living standard budget level issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

exceed 85 percent of LLSIL. However, sponsors are encouraged to give preference to economically disadvantaged youth. In addition, sponsors may design a special component using up to 10 percent of their YETP funds for programs to serve a mixture of youth from families with incomes above and below 85 percent of LLSIL and who are and are not economically disadvantaged.

Differences in economic status were statistically significant. Those with incomes of 70 percent or less of LLSIL comprised 87.9 percent in CEE versus 94.8 in IIBWE.

Economic Status at Time of Enrollment

Six-month annualized income as a percent of LLSIL	Percent of respondents IIBWE	CEE	TSO
70 or less	a/94.8	87.9	97.1
71 to 85	2.5	9.4	0.4
86 to 100	0.3	-	0.4
More than 100	2.3	2.6	2.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

a/We did not attempt to determine why all IIBWE respondents were not from families with income of 70 percent or less of LLSIL as required for program eligibility.

We found no statistically significant differences in the public assistance status of persons in CEE and IIB. Those receiving no public assistance comprised 65.6 percent in CEE versus 59.8 percent in IIBWE. Likewise, for those who received public assistance, primarily Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Supplemental Security Income, no significant differences existed.

Participant experiences in CETA

Our comparison of participants' length of enrollment in CEE and IIBWE during the sample period revealed some statistically significant differences. The number enrolled 2 to 3 months was significantly different: 29.4 percent in CEE versus 15.9 percent in IIBWE. Other significant differences were indicated for those enrolled for 8 to 9 months--16.2 percent in CEE compared to 32.9 percent in IIBWE--and for 10 to 18 months--11.1 percent in CEE compared to 5.5 percent in IIBWE. The vast majority of respondents in both programs were enrolled no more than 9 months, indicating that programs may have been designed around the school year.

Months Enrolled in Program

Months	Percent of respondents IIBWE	CEE	TSO
1 or less	7.3	10.3	38.2
2 to 3	15.9	29.4	47.4
4 to 5	20.4	17.6	6.4
6 to 7	15.1	13.3	2.8
8 to 9	32.9	16.2	2.8
10 to 18	5.5	11.1	2.4
19 or more	2.9	2.1	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Many respondents had CETA enrollment at other times than the period that resulted in their inclusion in our sample. In comparing the number of other enrollments for CEE and IIBWE participants, we found no statistically significant differences. About 56 percent of those in IIBWE and 54 percent of those in CEE had been enrolled in CETA at least one other time. Also, IIBWE accounted for 23 percent of those who had been enrolled more than one other time and CEE accounted for 22 percent.

Another point of comparison was the number of other times enrolled in CETA when enrollments in the Summer Youth Employment program (SYEP) 1/ were excluded. Again, we found no statistically significant differences between the two programs. About 26 percent of those in IIBWE had been enrolled in CETA at least one other time; about 29 percent of those in CEE had been enrolled at least one other time. As for enrollments more than one other time, IIBWE accounted for about 9 percent and CEE accounted for about 11 percent.

A fourth comparison was the number of months that CEE and IIBWE participants were enrolled in CETA at other times. The majority were enrolled 9 months or less and except for one length of enrollment category, there were no statistically significant differences between the two programs. The one significant difference occurred in the 7- to 9-month category (including SYEP enrollments). About 18 percent of IIBWE participants were enrolled 7 to 9 months compared to about 10 percent for CEE.

1/SYEP, authorized by title IVC of CETA, is designed to provide during the summer months useful work, basic education, and institutional or on-the-job training to assist youth to develop maximum occupational potential and to obtain unsubsidized employment.

The program in which IIBWE and CEE respondents most frequently had been enrolled in at other times was SYEP: 47.2 percent in IIBWE and 41.4 percent in CEE. Some respondents had been enrolled in the same program at least twice. For example, 20.8 percent of the IIBWE respondents had been enrolled in IIBWE at some other time, and 22.4 percent of the CEE respondents had been enrolled in CEE at another time.

The types of work experience jobs held by IIBWE and CEE respondents were similar. The jobs most frequently held by both IIBWE and CEE respondents were clerical and custodial in nature. Only in the health/medical service category was there a statistically significant difference in the number of respondents who held that type of job: 4.8 percent in IIBWE and 14.3 percent in CEE.

Type of Work Done in Last Work Experience Job Before Termination

Type work	Percent of respondents IIBWE	CEE
Child care/elderly care	3.2	5.2
Clerical/secretarial	31.6	27.2
Community/social services	1.8	2.9
Conservation/landscaping	6.7	5.7
Education	5.7	8.8
Food service/restaurant	3.7	2.2
Health/medical service	4.8	14.3
Library work	1.0	4.8
Maintenance/general repair	30.4	21.6
Recreation	8.3	2.2
Other (note a)	2.8	5.1
	100.0	100.0

a/Includes such types of work as agricultural, auto repair, printing/graphics, and manufacturing.

Respondents generally gave similar reasons for leaving IIBWE and CEE programs. According to the reasons given by the former participants, a majority of them terminated for positive reasons: 71.2 percent in IIBWE and 70.6 percent in CEE. Over one-half of the positive reasons simply were that the program ended or that the school year ended: 65.7 percent in IIBWE and 54.1 in CEE.

APPENDIX I

Reasons Given by Participants for Leaving Program

	Percent of respondents		
Positive terminations	IIBWE	CEE	TSO
Graduated from school	13.4	24.5	7.5
I completed the program before graduation	3.6	3.3	4.9
Program ended	37.6	33.9	44.1
School ended	9.2	4.3	7.9
Went to work	7.4	4.6	7.5
Subtotal	71.2	70.6	71.9
Other terminations			
Moved away from area	2.8	4.1	0.8
Had to take care of a family member	-	1.2	0.7
Quit school	3.3	4.2	0.4
Got sick or pregnant	2.3	4.6	4.2
Found out I was not eligible	1.4	1.3	-
Did not get any training in a skill	2.3	1.1	2.2
Did not like the job I was doing	2.6	2.3	3.9
Did not like my supervisor	2.3	1.1	-
Did not like where my job was	1.2	0.2	-
Transportation problems	2.7	2.4	5.3
Other	7.9	6.9	10.6
Subtotal	28.8	29.4	28.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Academic credit awarded to participants

As previously discussed, YETP requires prime sponsors to encourage LEAs to award academic credit for participants' experience in YETP. For YETP, about 87 percent of the sponsors with LEA agreements said they had made academic credit arrangements in at least one LEA agreement and for IIB, 54 percent of those with LEA agreements had made academic credit arrangements in at least one LEA agreement. Yet, for IIBWE and CEE, we were able to identify relatively few former participants who had received academic credit for their involvement in the programs. However, significantly more had received academic credit in CEE than in IIBWE: 21.6 percent in CEE versus 13.2 percent in IIBWE.

EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCES OF PARTICIPANTS

Educational experience of former participants

Most IIBWE and CEE respondents were attending some kind of school at the time of our survey. The number in IIBWE was significantly more than in CEE: 74 percent in IIBWE compared to 56.5 percent in CEE. Of those still in school, most were attending high school, and significantly more respondents were attending high school in IIBWE than in CEE: 52.2 percent in IIBWE and 31.3 percent in CEE. The next most prevalent type was college or university, but the difference between IIBWE and CEE was not significant.

Type School Attended by Respondents at Time of Survey

Type school	Percent of respondents IIBWE	CEE	TSO
Not attending any kind of school	26.0	43.5	21.8
High school	52.2	31.3	67.4
Alternative school	0.7	0.7	-
Trade, technical, or vocational	5.5	5.7	3.4
Junior or community college (2 years)	3.6	6.2	5.1
College or university	6.4	10.4	1.7
Other	5.7	2.2	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Although most of the respondents who were no longer in school had either graduated from high school or obtained a high school equivalency certificate, many had dropped out of high school before graduating: 41.6 percent in IIBWE and 37.7 percent in CEE. This difference was not statistically significant.

Employment experiences of former participants

About the same proportion of IIBWE and CEE respondents had found unsubsidized jobs after leaving the program: 54.6 percent in IIBWE and 62.8 percent in CEE. However, many who had found jobs were unemployed at the time of our survey: 41.3 percent in IIBWE and 49.3 percent in CEE. This difference was not statistically significant.

In both IIBWE and CEE, a higher proportion of respondents no longer in school had found unsubsidized jobs: 73.9 percent in IIBWE and 74.3 percent in CEE. But, of those no longer in school who had found jobs, many in both CEE and IIBWE were unemployed at the time of our survey: 40.6 percent in IIBWE and 65.7 percent in CEE. This difference was not statistically significant.

As can be seen in the following table, the predominant types of work done by respondents in their first unsubsidized job after termination were in the fields of food service/restaurant, clerical/secretarial, retail trade, and maintenance/general repair. Only in the retail trade category was there a significant difference between IIBWE and CEE with respect to the type of first unsubsidized jobs held by former participants: 9.8 percent in IIBWE versus 15.8 percent in CEE.

Type of Work Done in First Unsubsidized Job After Termination

Type work	Percent of respondents who found jobs IIBWE	CEE
Agriculture	3.1	6.8
Auto repair	2.2	0.6
Child care/elderly care	4.5	2.2
Clerical/secretarial	14.4	13.0
Community/social services	1.4	-
Conservation/landscaping	2.6	3.1
Education	0.7	-
Food service/restaurant	22.6	20.3
Health/medical service	3.3	1.9
Library work	-	0.8
Maintenance/general repair	7.0	10.3
Manufacturing/factory work	6.1	8.4
Media/communication	0.6	-
Printing/graphics	0.8	0.3
Recreation	1.9	0.7
Retail trade (sales)	9.8	15.8
Skilled building trade	6.8	3.0
Transportation	1.0	-
Warehousing	2.4	4.9
Armed Forces	2.0	1.7
Other	6.8	6.2
	100.0	100.0

VIEWS OF PARTICIPANTS ON HOW THE PROGRAMS HELPED THEM

Participants' views on how programs have helped them may be affected by their expectations at the time they entered the program. In IIBWE and CEE, similar proportions of respondents said work experience was their primary reason for enrolling: 42.5 percent in IIBWE and 47.8 percent in CEE. In IIBWE and CEE, about one-third said money was their primary reason for enrolling, and in both programs, almost one-fifth said training was their primary reason.

Of the respondents who had found an unsubsidized job, about the same number in IIBWE and CEE said the program had provided either knowledge, skills, training, or other help that had assisted them in getting their first job: 52.2 percent in IIBWE and 54.2 percent in CEE. Of those who had left their first unsubsidized job but were employed in another job at the time of our survey, the number who said the program had in some way helped them get their current job was significantly different: 53.9 percent in IIBWE and 30.6 percent in CEE.

Our questionnaire asked respondents to consider possible types of help the program may have provided and to indicate those they found most helpful. In both IIBWE and CEE, the types of help found to be most helpful related to learning about job preferences, learning proper on-the-job behavior, and learning job seeking skills. As shown in the table that follows, the respondents' views were quite similar on the helpfulness of the programs in assisting them toward their education and employment goals. In fact, there were no statistically significant differences between the views of IIBWE and CEE respondents.

About one-third or less of all respondents said the program had helped them stay in school: 27.2 percent in IIBWE and 34.9 percent in CEE. Narrowing the analysis to those who had left the program because of graduation, we found that significantly more in CEE than in IIBWE said the program had helped them to stay in school: 51.0 percent in CEE and 23.6 percent in IIBWE. Also, among those who had found an unsubsidized job, significantly more in CEE said the program had helped them stay in school: 38.4 percent in CEE and 28.8 percent in IIBWE.

Both IIBWE and CEE are designed to provide training and a variety of services--one of which is placement assistance. Few respondents said the sponsors had helped find them a job when the program ended: 8.4 percent in IIBWE and 6.4 percent in CEE. Among those who had left the program because of graduation, those who said the program had helped find them a job constituted 9.6 percent in IIBWE and 9.0 percent in CEE.

APPENDIX I

Kinds of Help Participants Found To Be of Great Benefit (note a)

Type of help	Percent of respondents IIBWE	CEE	TSO
Helped me decide what kind of jobs I like	48.3	49.8	68.6
Taught me how to act at work	51.7	51.6	58.2
Taught me how to get along with other workers	66.2	65.5	55.0
Taught me how to get along with my boss	52.2	51.6	49.6
Taught me how to dress at work	32.1	31.9	51.6
Taught me to be at work on time	55.1	55.5	56.8
Showed me how to look for a job	39.7	39.2	62.5
Showed me how to fill out an application	40.7	43.3	60.5
Showed me how to have a job interview	45.0	46.9	71.4
Taught me how to do a specific job like welding, secretarial, or other	30.6	35.0	26.9
Helped me stay in school	27.2	34.9	25.1
Helped arrange for transportation to my job	9.4	12.7	15.6
Found a job for me when the program ended	8.4	6.4	10.4
Child care for my child	3.6	4.5	3.8
Health care for me	6.0	8.1	13.8
Gave me extra help with my school work	12.5	12.2	15.6
Other	9.7	7.3	13.8

a/We asked the respondents to check all kinds of help that applied.

A vast majority of the respondents in IIBWE and CEE said that their overall experience in the program was either very good or somewhat good: 91.7 percent in IIBWE and 95 percent in CEE.

Participants' Overall Rating of Program Experiences

Rating	Percent of respondents IIBWE	CEE	TSO
1. Very good	67.4	69.1	77.4
2. Somewhat good	24.3	25.9	19.4
3. Not good - not poor	6.5	2.3	2.8
4. Somewhat poor	0.7	1.1	0.4
5. Very poor	1.1	1.7	-
	100.0	100.0	100.0

CONCLUSIONS

Significantly more prime sponsors served in-school youth under YETP than under IIB. In comparing YETP and IIB in-school youth programs, we found few statistically significant differences. In essence, the similarities between the two programs were far more noticeable than the differences. However, there were some basic differences that could have implications for future employment and training legislation.

The Congress established YETP in part to forge a link between school systems and employment and training programs for youth. This linkage was to be accomplished by requiring prime sponsors (1) to spend at least 22 percent of their funds pursuant to written agreements with LEAs and (2) to encourage LEAs to award participants academic credit for program participation. The results of our work indicated that, with respect to these two requirements, there were differences between the YETP and IIB programs. Under YETP, prime sponsors had more LEA agreements and spent considerably more dollars pursuant to those agreements than under IIB.

Similarly, prime sponsors and LEAs had made more arrangements for awarding academic credit under YETP than under IIB. Although few participants had received academic credit for either program, significantly more YETP participants than IIB participants were awarded credit (22 percent compared to 13 percent). However, one might expect that a higher proportion of YETP participants would have received credit because IIB does not require sponsors to encourage award of academic credit.

Both IIB and YETP provided a variety of activities and services to in-school youth. The two programs offer the same kinds of activities but YETP permits a greater array of services. Even so, a look at the additional services permitted under YETP, plus those that are the same for both programs (including activities), indicated no statistically significant differences exist between what youth were provided under YETP and IIB.

Regarding participants, we found few differences between YETP and IIB. A profile of those who participated in IIB and YETP revealed that the participants had similar demographic characteristics, such as race and sex, as well as CETA experiences and public assistance status. They differed, however, in terms of economic status and age.

Given the attention which has been focused on merging IIB and YETP, the data presented in this report point out that the differences found between the two programs tended to stem from specific objectives in the YETP legislation. The differences in formal sponsor-LEA linkage and awarding academic credit suggest that continued realization of these objectives may require specific attention in future legislation. On the other hand and of no less importance is the fact that the data also reveal many similarities between CETA's two in-school youth programs.

SPONSOR VIEWS ON FUTURE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

In the survey questionnaire for prime sponsors, we asked them to indicate the extent to which they favored potential provisions of future employment and training legislation as it would affect youth programs. A majority of the sponsors were strongly in favor of

--a separately funded youth program in addition to SYEP and Job Corps,

--emphasis on employability development and world-of-work orientation, and

--a required link to the private sector with respect to job placement. (See pp. 23 and 41.)

To a lesser but still significant extent, sponsors favored an emphasis on skills training in future youth programs, but they were divided on the extent of emphasis that should be given to remedial training.

The provision that the sponsors indicated they least favored was limiting eligibility to out-of-school youth, but they were divided on the question of whether eligibility should be limited to youth with incomes of no more than 70 percent of LLSIL.

A significant majority of the sponsors were not in favor of requiring a link to the private sector with respect to financial incentives, but their views were divided on the question of requiring a link to the private sector for advice. The sponsors also were divided with regard to an academic credit requirement.

Potential Provisions of Future Youth Employment and Training Programs

Potential provisions	Percent of sponsors: Favor to very great or great extent	Favor to moderate extent	Favor to some or little or no extent
Separately funded youth program in addition to SYEP and Job Corps	70.5	4.8	24.7
Academic credit requirement	27.3	24.2	48.5
Eligibility limited to youth with incomes at or below 70 percent of LLSIL	42.1	26.6	31.4
Eligibility limited to out-of-school youth only	4.8	5.0	90.2
Emphasis on skills training	47.1	33.5	19.4
Emphasis on employability development and world-of-work orientation	78.5	14.3	7.2
Emphasis on remedial training	39.5	33.9	27.6
Required link to private sector with respect to job placements	51.2	26.3	22.5
Required link to private sector with respect to financial incentives	19.7	26.8	53.5
Required link to private sector for advice	44.3	22.2	33.5
Set aside for LEAs	17.0	12.7	70.3

REVIEW METHODOLOGY

We approached our work from two perspectives. First, we designed a standardized survey questionnaire to mail to persons who had participated in YETP and IIB programs for in-school youth. Time limitations and resource constraints did not allow us to randomly select a nationwide sample of former participants; therefore, we judgmentally selected eight prime sponsors and randomly selected a total of 884 youths who had terminated from the sponsors' programs during the first 9 months of fiscal year 1981. The questionnaire focused mainly on their post-termination education and employment experiences and on their views on how the programs helped them with their education/employment goals. In addition, our staff visited the eight prime sponsors and collected from sponsor case files a standardized set of data on each randomly selected former participant.

Second, we designed a standardized survey questionnaire to obtain data about the differences and similarities in the structure and operation of prime sponsors' fiscal year 1981 in-school youth programs. Our staffmembers who visited the eight judgmentally selected sponsors used the questionnaire to obtain the needed data for those sponsors. To supplement our work at the 8 prime sponsors, we randomly selected a nationwide sample of 46 other prime sponsors to whom we mailed the questionnaire. Thus, our total sample size was 54 prime sponsors.

In both instances, our work focused on fiscal year 1981 programs because uncertainties about fiscal year 1982 funding existed at the time we were planning our work. The funding uncertainties made it impractical to plan work centering on fiscal year 1982 programs.

Questionnaire mailed to 884 former in-school youth program participants

Excluding prime sponsors in the trust territories and Puerto Rico (12 in all), 463 prime sponsors were operating CETA programs when we planned our work. From this universe, we judgmentally selected eight prime sponsors and randomly selected a sample of persons who had participated in CETA in-school youth programs. The sponsors were chosen to provide wide geographical representation, a mix of sponsor types and sizes, and a range of unemployment rates. The selection also was limited to sponsors who had operated both YETP and IIB in-school programs during fiscal year 1981.

Eight prime sponsors	Geographic location	Unemployment rate (note a)	Total 1981 enrollment YETP	IIB
City of Newark, NJ	Northeast	10.9	1,288	3,687
York County, PA	Northeast	6.5	326	117
City of Atlanta, GA	South	7.3	904	2,814
Balance of State, GA	South	5.9	3,579	11,162
City of Houston, TX	Southwest	5.1	759	3,232
Ft. Worth Consortium, TX	Southwest	5.8	911	2,394
City of Los Angeles, CA	West	7.4	3,203	12,473
Kern County, CA	West	7.6	989	2,992

a/August 1981.

We determined our sampling universe from listings provided by the eight prime sponsors showing who had terminated from their YETP and IIB in-school youth programs during October 1, 1980, to June 30, 1981. The YETP programs in which terminations had occurred were CEE at all eight sponsors and TSO at three sponsors. For IIB, terminations had occurred in IIBWE at all eight sponsors. We eliminated from these listings persons who had been enrolled 7 days or less before terminating, and we then randomly selected a total of 884 former participants, comprised of 339 in CEE, 90 in TSO, and 455 in IIBWE. Using a standardized data collection instrument, our staff gathered data on each person in our sample from sponsor case files.

We also mailed a standardized questionnaire to all sampled persons and offered to send them a $5 check for completing the questionnaire. We first mailed the questionnaire on December 15, 1981, and sent out followup mailings to nonrespondents on January 19, 1982, and February 8, 1982. We followed up by telephone to contact participants who had not responded by February 16, 1982. We ceased data gathering for participant questionnaires on March 12, 1982. The questionnaire was designed by our auditors and questionnaire design specialists and was pretested with former participants before the final design was reached.

A total of 708 persons, or 80.1 percent of the total sample, responded to the questionnaire. The response rate for each program was as follows: 76.1 percent for CEE, 91.1 percent for TSO, and 80.9 percent for IIBWE. Of the total respondents, 642 returned it through the mail, and 66 answered it over the telephone. Using a computer, we merged, tabulated, and analyzed questionnaire response data and data from case files.

Our sample of participants did not permit the results to be projected statistically to the nationwide universe of former fiscal year 1981 participants, but the results are projectable to former participants in the combined CEE programs, combined IIBWE programs, and combined TSO programs of the eight judgmentally

selected sponsors. The combined sample results are weighted based on the universe and sample size for each sponsor for each program, that is, universe size divided by sample size equals weight.

The nonrespondent group for this study is similar to the respondent group. For the most part, no statistically significant differences occurred in demographic characteristics, such as sex, race, and age. The two groups were also similar with respect to their public assistance status, enrollments in CETA, and the extent to which they received academic credit for their CETA participation. Finally, although the groups did have statistically significant differences on a few demographic characteristics, we do not believe the nonrespondent group would have changed our findings had they responded to our questionnaire.

Our sampling plan for the participant data was designed to provide a sample size that would yield an expected sampling error of plus or minus 8 percent on a response upheld by 50 percent of the population (at the 95-percent confidence level). The actual sampling error, however, on any particular response estimate depends on the percentage of participants who responded, the percentage of times it was appropriate to respond to a particular question, and the distribution of responses within each program. We calculated the sampling errors for all CEE and IIBWE estimates considered important to our report findings. We also calculated sampling errors for estimates that were, on the basis of identical variables for the two programs, 5 or more percentage points apart. The upper and lower limits of these estimates were then calculated. The ranges are shown in appendix IV.

Programmatic questionnaire for sample of 54 prime sponsors

We designed a standardized survey questionnaire to obtain comparative data on sponsors' fiscal year 1981 programs. Our staff obtained these data for the eight judgmentally selected sponsors while visiting them to review the case files of sampled former participants. We interviewed sponsor officials and reviewed program plans, LEA agreements, subcontracts, grant funding documents, and statistical and expenditure reports. We did not perform audit work at LEAs.

Additionally, after eliminating the eight sponsors from the sponsor universe, we randomly selected 46, or 10 percent of the remaining 455 sponsors, to receive the questionnaire through the mail.

Because not all sponsors operated IIB in-school programs, we took steps to insure that the 46 sponsors were representative of the universe. We obtained from Labor the most recent (fiscal year 1980) IIB program statistical report for every sponsor in the universe, and we examined the reports for indications of the extent

to which sponsors operated IIB in-school programs. Then, for the 46 sponsors versus the universe, we compared the proportions of sponsors that did not have IIB in-school programs. The proportions were similar and, thus, the sample was representative of the universe.

The survey questionnaire was designed by our auditors and questionnaire design specialists based on preliminary work which included researching pertinent statutes and regulations; visiting selected prime sponsors to interview sponsor officials and to review program related documents; visiting Labor's Atlanta regional office to interview regional officials and to review prime sponsor files; and pretesting the questionnaire by asking several prime sponsors to complete it before we arrived at the final design. In addition, Labor headquarters officials reviewed a copy of the questionnaire while in draft form, and their comments were considered in the final design.

On December 8, 1981, we mailed the questionnaire to the 46 randomly selected sponsors and 41 responded. Upon receiving their responses, our staff reviewed and analyzed the questionnaires for completeness, logic, and internal consistency. As needed, our auditors telephoned the prime sponsors to clarify or obtain more complete answers.

To generate statistically projectable nationwide results, we combined the data for the eight judgmentally selected prime sponsors with the data for the 41 randomly selected sponsors who responded to our questionnaire. Data for each of the 8 sponsors were given a weight of 1, and data for the 41 sponsors were given a weight of 10. Thus, our results are projectable to 418 of the 463 prime sponsors included in our universe.

For the 46 randomly selected prime sponsors, we used a 10-percent sample precision rate. That is, the sample size was designed for an overall sampling error of plus or minus 10 percent at the 95-percent confidence level. The actual sampling error on any one response estimate depends, however, on the percentage of prime sponsors not responding and the percentage of times appropriate to respond to a particular question. Regarding the latter, our estimates are subject to combined variation larger than anticipated because the number of LEA agreements and non-LEA contracts varied considerably among prime sponsors, ranging from none to as many as 32. Again, the sampling errors for variables important to our report findings were computed, and the upper and lower limits of the estimates were calculated. See appendix IV for the ranges.

Universe Size, Sample Size, and Questionnaire Response Rates: Persons Who Terminated From In-School Programs of Eight Prime Sponsors During October 1, 1980 - June 30, 1981

Sponsor	YETP Career Employment Experience				YETP Transition Services Only				Title IIB Work Experience			
	Universe (terminations)	Sample size	Response rate		Universe (terminations)	Sample size	Response rate		Universe (terminations)	Sample size	Response rate	
			Number	Percent			Number	Percent			Number	Percent
1. Atlanta	122	45	39	86.7	-	-	-	-	181	45	33	73.3
2. Balance of Georgia	712	70	58	82.9	25	25	20	80.0	848	70	58	82.9
3. Houston	22	22	15	68.2	25	15	13	86.7	768	70	60	85.7
4. Ft. Worth Consortium	3	3	3	100.0	211	50	49	98.0	295	50	40	80.0
5. Los Angeles	263	50	36	72.0	-	-	-	-	643	65	48	73.8
6. Kern County	329	49	41	83.7	-	-	-	-	185	45	35	77.8
7. York County	83	40	21	52.5	-	-	-	-	156	45	44	97.8
8. Newark	334	60	45	75.0	-	-	-	-	508	65	50	76.9
Total	1,868	339	258	76.1	261	90	82	91.1	3,584	455	368	80.9

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX III

Forty-Six Randomly Selected Sponsors

1. Bridgeport Consortium, CN
2. Salem Consortium, MA
3. Providence City, RI
4. Atlantic County, NJ
5. Balance of Essex County, NJ
6. Balance of Hudson County, NJ
7. Balance of Mercer County, NJ
8. Morris County, NJ
9. Trenton City, NJ
10. Chemung County, NY
11. Frederick County, MD
12. Montgomery County, PA
13. Pittsburgh City, PA
14. Chesterfield/Henrico Consortium, VA
15. Balance of Florida
16. Escambia County, FL
17. Lee County, FL
18. Leon/Gadsden Consortium, FL
19. St. Petersburg, FL
20. Balance of Mississippi
21. Tazewell County, IL
22. Ft. Wayne Consortium, IN
23. Muskegon/Oceana Consortium, MI
24. Columbus Consortium, OH
25. Rock County, WI
26. Marathon County, WI
27. Galveston County, TX
28. North Texas State Consortium, TX
29. Webb County, TX
30. Woodbury County, IA
31. Springfield City, MO
32. Balance of Jackson County, MO
33. St. Charles County, MO
34. Colorado Springs Consortium, CO
35. Balance of Utah
36. Oakland City, CA
37. Pasadena City, CA
38. Balance of California
39. Stanislaus County, CA
40. Shasta County, CA
41. Santa Cruz County, CA
42. Imperial County, CA
43. Balance of Hawaii
44. Balance of Clackamas County, OR
45. Balance of Lane County, OR
46. Kitsap County, WA

RESPONSE DATA, SAMPLING ERRORS, AND STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR SELECTED PARTICIPANT AND PRIME SPONSOR QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Statistical sampling of the universes (participants and sponsors) enabled us to draw conclusions about universes. Results of statistical sampling are subject to uncertainty (i.e., sampling error) because only a portion of the universe is analyzed. Sampling error consists of two parts: confidence level and range. Confidence level is the degree of confidence that can be placed in estimates derived from the sample. The range is the upper and lower limits between which the actual universe value may be found. For the projections and estimates that follow, the chances are 95 in 100 that the actual percentages would be between the ranges shown. In cases in which the sampling error would have resulted in ranges with lower end values of less than zero percent or upper end values greater than 100 percent, we simply show zero as the lowest value or 100 as the highest value.

The reader will note while looking through the tables in this appendix that ranges for some categories are not shown. In these cases, we did not compute sampling errors because, based on our sampling plan, we generally applied the statistical rule of thumb that differences of 5 percent or less between program results would not be statistically significant.

Table 4.1

Participant Characteristics

	Percent of respondents		Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level		Statistically significant
	IIBWE	CEE	IIBWE	CEE	
Sex					
Male	45.7	50.1	40.7 to 50.7	43.8 to 56.4	No
Female	54.3	49.9	49.3 to 59.3	43.6 to 56.2	No
Race					
White	21.1	26.9	17.3 to 24.9	21.3 to 32.5	No
Black	61.6	56.2	56.8 to 66.4	50.4 to 62.0	No
Hispanic	16.5	14.1	13.0 to 20.0	10.7 to 17.5	No
Age					
14	11.3	1.1	8.0 to 14.6	0.7 to 1.5	Yes
15	19.8	3.6	15.6 to 24.0	1.1 to 6.1	Yes
16	28.4	31.5	23.8 to 33.0	25.8 to 37.2	No
17	27.8	44.1	23.2 to 32.4	38.1 to 50.3	Yes
18	10.1	14.0	7.0 to 13.2	9.5 to 18.5	No
Public assistance received					
None	59.8	65.6	54.8 to 64.8	59.8 to 71.4	No
Aid to Families with Dependent Children	30.9	25.8	26.2 to 35.6	20.4 to 31.2	No
Six-month economic status					
70% or less of LLSIL	94.8	87.9	92.5 to 97.1	82.1 to 92.7	Yes
71-85%	2.5	9.4	0.9 to 4.1	5.6 to 13.2	Yes

Table 4.2

Months Enrolled in Sample Period Program

Months	Percent of respondents		Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level		Statistically significant
	IIBWE	CEE	IIBWE	CEE	
1 or less	7.3	10.3	4.5 to 10.1	6.4 to 14.2	No
2 - 3	15.9	29.4	12.4 to 19.4	24.5 to 34.3	Yes
4 - 5	20.4	17.6	16.1 to 24.7	12.7 to 22.5	No
6 - 7	15.1	13.3	11.3 to 18.9	8.9 to 17.7	No
8 - 9	32.9	16.2	28.5 to 37.3	11.4 to 21.0	Yes
10 - 18	5.5	11.1	3.5 to 7.5	7.3 to 14.9	Yes
19 or more	2.9	2.1	1.5 to 4.3	0.7 to 3.5	No

Table 4.3

Number of Other Times Enrolled in CETA Programs

Number	Percent of respondents (including SYEP enrollments)		Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level		Statistically significant
	IIBWE	CEE	IIBWE	CEE	
0	43.6	45.9	38.9 to 48.3	39.8 to 52.0	No
1	33.3	32.5	28.5 to 38.1	26.6 to 38.4	No
2	12.2	12.2	9.1 to 15.3	7.8 to 16.6	No
3	6.0	4.7	3.7 to 8.3	1.6 to 7.8	No
4	1.5	2.6	0.7 to 2.3	0.3 to 4.9	No
5	3.4	2.1	1.6 to 5.2	0.0 to 4.3	No

Number	Percent of respondents (excluding SYEP enrollments)		Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level		Statistically significant
	IIBWE	CEE	IIBWE	CEE	
0	74.3	71.5	70.4 to 78.2	65.7 to 77.3	No
1	16.9	17.1	13.3 to 20.5	12.2 to 22.0	No
2	5.6	8.8	3.3 to 7.9	4.8 to 12.8	No
3	1.6	1.4	0.6 to 2.6	0.0 to 3.2	No
4	1.0	1.4	0.5 to 1.5	0.0 to 3.2	No
5	0.6	0.0	0.2 to 1.0	0.0 to 0.0	No

Table 4.4

Total Months Enrolled in Other Programs

Total months (including SYEP)	Percent of respondents (including SYEP enrollments) IIBWE	CEE	Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level IIBWE	CEE	Statistically significant
3 or less	48.5	52.0	44.5 to 52.5	46.3 to 57.7	No
4 - 6	16.3	18.5	13.8 to 18.8	14.5 to 22.5	No
7 - 9	17.9	9.5	15.1 to 20.7	6.5 to 12.5	Yes
10 - 12	3.9	5.4	2.5 to 5.3	3.2 to 7.6	No
13 - 15	7.1	5.7	5.2 to 9.0	3.3 to 8.1	No
16 - 18	1.4	2.6	0.9 to 1.9	0.8 to 4.4	No
19 - 24	3.2	3.8	1.8 to 4.6	1.6 to 6.0	No
More than 24	1.7	2.5	0.8 to 2.6	0.7 to 4.3	No

Total months (excluding SYEP)	Percent of respondents (excluding SYEP enrollments) IIBWE	CEE	Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level IIBWE	CEE	Statistically significant
3 or less	26.0	29.6	22.2 to 29.8	24.3 to 34.9	No
4 - 6	29.2	23.9	26.6 to 31.8	20.3 to 27.5	No
7 - 9	24.2	17.9	21.7 to 26.7	14.9 to 20.9	No
10 - 12	5.6	14.3	4.4 to 6.8	11.5 to 17.1	No
13 - 15	5.7	2.4	4.9 to 6.5	1.1 to 3.7	No
16 - 18	6.5	7.2	5.1 to 7.9	5.0 to 9.4	No
19 - 24	2.8	4.7	2.2 to 3.4	2.9 to 6.5	No
More than 24	0.0	0.0			

Table 4.5

Programs Enrolled in at Other Times

Other programs	Percent of respondents IIBWE	CEE	Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level IIBWE	CEE	Statistically significant
SYEP	47.2	41.4	42.6 to 51.8	35.1 to 47.7	No
IIBWE	20.8	8.7	17.0 to 24.6	4.7 to 12.7	Yes
CEE	1.2	22.4	0.4 to 2.0	16.9 to 27.9	Yes
TSO	1.4	0.0	0.5 to 2.3	0.0 to 0.0	No
II-B classroom training (in-school)	0.2	0.7	0.0 to 0.6	0.0 to 2.0	No
II-B (out-of-school)	4.8	0.0	4.1 to 5.5	0.0 to 0.0	Yes
Other	0.7	3.4	0.0 to 1.6	1.1 to 5.7	No

Table 4.6

Type of Work Most Frequently Done in Last Work Experience Job

Type work	Percent of respondents IIBWE	CEE	Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level IIBWE	CEE	Statistically significant
Clerical/secretarial	31.6	27.2	27.1 to 36.1	21.5 to 32.9	No
Health/medical service	4.8	14.3	2.6 to 7.0	9.9 to 18.7	Yes
Maintenance/general repair	30.4	21.6	25.8 to 35.0	16.4 to 26.8	No

Table 4.7

Selected Participant Information

	Percent of respondents		Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level		Statistically significant
	IIBWE	CEE	IIBWE	CEE	
Respondents who received academic credit	13.2	21.6	10.9 to 15.5	17.5 to 25.7	Yes
Reasons for entering program					
Money	36.5	33.3	31.6 to 41.4	27.2 to 39.4	No
Training	18.5	18.9	14.7 to 22.3	14.2 to 23.6	No
Work experience	42.5	47.8	37.4 to 47.6	41.5 to 54.1	No
Reasons for leaving program					
Positive reasons	71.2	70.6	66.7 to 75.7	64.9 to 76.3	No
Other reasons	28.8	29.4	24.3 to 33.3	23.7 to 35.1	No
Type of school attended at time of survey					
Not attending school	26.0	43.5	21.6 to 30.4	37.5 to 49.5	Yes
High school	52.2	31.3	47.1 to 57.3	25.8 to 36.8	Yes
College or university	6.4	10.4	4.1 to 8.7	6.9 to 13.9	No
Participant found a non-CETA job	54.6	62.8	49.4 to 59.8	56.8 to 68.8	No
Participant found non-CETA job but unemployed at time of survey	41.3	49.3	34.5 to 48.1	41.8 to 56.8	No
Participant said program helped get current job	53.9	30.6	52.0 to 55.8	28.0 to 33.2	Yes
Participant said program helped me stay in school	27.2	34.9	22.7 to 31.7	28.9 to 40.9	No
Overall rating of CETA experience					
Very good/somewhat good	91.7	95.0	88.6 to 94.8	92.0 to 98.0	No
Not good/not poor	6.5	2.3	4.0 to 9.0	0.7 to 3.9	Yes
Type work done in first job after termination					
Retail trade (sales)	9.8	15.8	7.5 to 12.1	12.0 to 19.6	Yes

APPENDIX IV

	Percent of respondents		Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level		Statistically significant
	IIBWE	CEE	IIBWE	CEE	
Highest grade finished by those who left the program to go to work					
Grade 8 or below	0.0	0.0			
Grades 9, 10, or 11	59.9	32.5	56.6 to 63.3	31.0 to 34.0	Yes
High school graduate	35.5	55.1	33.7 to 37.3	52.9 to 57.3	Yes
GED	0.0	10.9	0.0 to 0.0	10.2 to 11.6	Yes
Some college	4.7	1.9			No
Other	0.0	0.0			
Highest grade finished by those still attending school					
Grade 8 or below	5.4	1.2	3.2 to 7.6	0.5 to 1.9	Yes
Grades 9, 10, or 11	73.2	56.3	68.1 to 78.3	50.6 to 62.0	Yes
High school graduate	12.8	28.8	9.2 to 16.4	23.5 to 34.1	Yes
GED	0.2	2.6			No
Some college	6.8	9.9			No
Other	1.6	1.2			No
Respondents who left program due to graduation					
Said program had helped them stay in school	23.6	51.0	21.1 to 26.1	47.6 to 55.6	Yes
Respondents who had quit school					
Said program found them a job when program ended	6.8	2.3	6.0 to 7.6	2.0 to 2.6	Yes
Respondents who had found a non-CETA job					
Said program helped them stay in school	28.8	38.4	25.5 to 32.1	34.6 to 42.2	Yes
Said program helped them decide on job preferences	40.0	49.2	35.9 to 44.1	43.3 to 55.1	Yes
Respondents who had not found a non-CETA job					
Said program helped them decide on job preferences	58.4	50.8	54.2 to 62.6	46.1 to 55.5	Yes

Table 4.8

Information on Prime Sponsors' Agreements with Local Educational Agencies for FY 1981 In-School Youth Programs

	Percent of agreements		Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level		Statistically significant
	YETP	IIB	YETP	IIB	
LEA agreement targeted service to specific group	36.8	12.1	17.5 to 56.1	0.0 to 26.2	No
LEA agreement was financial	46.9	20.6	25.7 to 68.1	1.2 to 40.0	No
Activities and services provided under LEA agreements					
Classroom skills training	11.2	3.7	0.0 to 24.5	0.0 to 10.8	No
Other classroom training	33.3	10.9	14.0 to 52.6	0.0 to 23.0	No
On-the-job training	18.2	6.0	0.3 to 36.1	0.0 to 14.5	No
Work experience	95.6	96.4	91.2 to 100.0	89.3 to 100.0	No
Orientation to world of work	100.0	98.7	100.0 to 100.0	96.3 to 100.0	No
Counseling or testing	100.0	100.0	100.0 to 100.0	98.5 to 100.0	No
Employability assessment	93.8	99.9	86.8 to 100.0	99.9 to 99.9	No
Job development	96.0	95.1	92.4 to 99.6	87.3 to 100.0	No
Job search	95.5	83.3	91.8 to 99.2	59.7 to 100.0	No
Job referral and placement	96.1	84.4	92.5 to 99.7	61.2 to 100.0	No
Vocational exploration	27.6	16.6	9.5 to 45.7	0.0 to 38.2	No
Education-to-work activities	74.5	57.0	48.3 to 100.0	12.3 to 100.0	No
Labor market information	95.6	97.4	91.6 to 99.6	92.7 to 100.0	No
Literacy training	32.7	23.8	15.2 to 50.2	0.0 to 51.0	No
Job sampling	32.2	16.8	13.0 to 51.4	0.0 to 41.3	No
Job restructuring	20.5	3.7	4.4 to 36.6	0.0 to 9.3	No
Overcoming sex stereotyping	66.2	51.2	41.3 to 91.1	9.3 to 93.1	No

APPENDIX IV

Table 4.9

Information on Prime Sponsors' Contracts with Non-Local Educational Agencies for FY 1981 In-School Youth Programs

	Percent of contracts		Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level		Statistically significant
	YETP	IIB	YETP	IIB	
Selected contractor to reach specific target group	67.1	93.0	43.0 to 91.2	81.4 to 100.0	No
Activities and services provided under non-LEA contracts					
Classroom skills training	14.9	3.8	6.9 to 22.9	3.8 to 3.8	No
Other classroom training	40.7	26.3	23.1 to 58.3	5.9 to 46.7	No
On-the-job training	14.0	0.0	0.5 to 27.5	0.0 to 0.0	No
Work experience	65.1	82.8	45.3 to 84.9	58.8 to 100.0	No
Orientation to world of work	88.0	69.4	77.5 to 98.5	42.8 to 96.0	No
Counseling or testing	90.8	89.3	81.6 to 100.0	77.6 to 100.0	No
Employability assessment	78.9	72.0	66.0 to 91.8	45.4 to 98.6	No
Job development	81.4	83.3	68.5 to 94.3	68.6 to 97.8	No
Job search	69.7	78.0	50.9 to 88.5	56.0 to 100.0	No
Job referral and placement	83.9	89.2	71.7 to 96.1	76.1 to 100.0	No
Vocational exploration	21.1	12.4	5.3 to 36.9	0.0 to 34.1	No
Education-to-work activities	76.1	48.4	57.2 to 95.0	20.7 to 76.1	No
Labor market information	87.4	84.9	75.7 to 99.1	69.5 to 100.0	No
Literacy training	45.1	32.3	26.8 to 63.4	5.0 to 59.6	No
Job sampling	37.9	24.7	19.2 to 56.6	0.0 to 52.2	No
Job restructuring	5.7	22.0	0.0 to 13.6	2.6 to 41.4	No
Overcoming sex stereotyping	68.5	54.3	51.1 to 85.9	28.4 to 80.2	No

Table 4.10

Selected Prime Sponsor Information on Service to In-School Youth

	Percent of sponsor		Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level		Statistically significant
	YETP	IIB	YETP	IIB	
Sponsor served in-school youth in FY 1981	100.0	66.5	100.0 to 100.0	52.9 to 80.1	Yes
Sponsor entered written agreements with local educational agencies	99.8	55.4	95.4 to 100.0	41.7 to 69.1	Yes
Sponsor administered part of program directly--independently of LEA agreement or contracts	17.2	48.2	6.5 to 27.9	34.9 to 61.5	Yes

APPENDIX IV

APPENDIX IV

Table 4.11

Sponsor and LEA Interaction
Pre- and Post-YETP

	Percent of agreements	Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level
Sponsor/LEA Interaction Before YETP		
Very good/somewhat good	76.5	60.7 to 92.3
Neither good nor poor	13.5	0.1 to 26.9
Somewhat poor/very poor	10.0	1.7 to 18.3
Sponsor And LEA Had Joint Program Before YETP		
Yes	44.1	21.3 to 66.9
No	55.9	33.2 to 78.6
Sponsor And LEA Had Written Agreements Before YETP		
Yes - financial	18.6	0.0 to 41.5
Yes - nonfinancial	48.2	25.5 to 70.9
No	33.3	18.3 to 48.3
Did Sponsor Have To Persuade LEA To Enter Agreement After YETP Enacted		
Had to persuade LEA	33.0	13.2 to 52.8
LEA actively sought agreement	10.4	1.9 to 18.9
Sponsor & LEA mutually desired an agreement	56.6	34.0 to 79.2
Without YETP Sponsor Would Have Used Non-LEA More		
Yes	10.1	0.0 to 23.1
No	71.4	54.1 to 88.7
Unsure	18.5	6.0 to 31.0
Comparison Of Pre- And Post-YETP Interaction With LEA		
Improved greatly/improved somewhat	67.7	48.1 to 87.3
Stayed about the same	29.8	10.9 to 48.7
Became somewhat worse/ became much worse	2.4	0.5 to 4.3

Table 4.12

Extent to Which Sponsors Would Favor Possible Provisions of Future Employment and Training Legislation

Possible Provisions Of Future Legislation	Extent sponsors would favor: Very great/great	Extent sponsors would favor: Some/little or no	Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level: Very great/great	Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent confidence level: Some/little or no	Statistically significant
Separately funded youth program	70.5	24.7	57.5 to 83.5	12.5 to 36.9	Yes
Academic credit requirement	27.3	48.5	14.7 to 39.9	34.3 to 62.7	No
Eligibility at 70% or less of LLSIL	42.1	31.4	28.1 to 56.1	18.1 to 44.7	No
Eligibility-out-of-school only	4.8	90.2	1.3 to 10.9	81.7 to 98.7	Yes
Emphasis on skills training	47.1	19.4	32.9 to 61.3	8.1 to 30.7	Yes
Emphasis on employability development	78.5	7.2	66.7 to 90.3	0.2 to 14.6	Yes
Emphasis on remedial training	39.5	27.6	25.6 to 53.4	15.0 to 40.2	No
Link to private sector for job placement	51.2	22.5	37.0 to 65.4	10.7 to 34.3	Yes
Link to private sector for financial incentive	19.7	53.5	8.4 to 31.0	39.3 to 67.7	Yes
Link to private sector for advice	44.3	33.5	30.2 to 58.4	20.0 to 47.0	No
Set asides for LEAs	17.0	70.3	6.3 to 27.7	57.3 to 83.3	Yes